

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE DOE and ANNE RASKIN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. C10-04700 TEH

ORDER REGARDING ISSUES
RAISED IN SECOND PRETRIAL
STATEMENT

This matter being set for the commencement of jury trial on April 3, 2012, and both parties having submitted substantial lists of anticipated witnesses, this Court issued an order on February 1, 2012, requiring a second pretrial statement in advance of the second pretrial conference, which is presently scheduled to occur on March 26, 2012, at 3:00 pm. On March 12, 2012, the parties timely filed their joint statement.

Though the Court's order called for a detailed account of each witness anticipated by each party, with a thorough statement of the anticipated testimony and relevance of each witness, the parties nevertheless further included a number of ostensible motions, including motions to exclude various witnesses, to bar the presentation of evidence on certain subject matter, and to exclude all exhibits of the defense for failure to comply with filing deadlines relative to the original trial date of January 10, 2012.


The Court regrets any confusion regarding the lodging of exhibits caused by the continuance of the trial date in this case and the accompanying order. Nevertheless, the inclusion of any argument, motion, request, or even quibble was not called for by the February 1 order, which simply requested a statement regarding anticipated testimony, for the sole purpose of clarifying the purpose of these witnesses for the Court and aiding in the efficient management of the coming trial. The deadline for the filing of motions *in limine* in

1 this matter was established as 21 days before the original trial date by the Order for Pretrial
2 Preparation of February 14, 2011, and all motions *in limine* have, at the present time, been
3 filed and ruled upon. The motions included in the March 12, 2012 statement are therefore
4 both inappropriate and untimely, and are, accordingly, DENIED.

5 In light of the continuing vagueness of the answers offered by counsel in this case
6 regarding the relevance of their anticipated witnesses, and the difficulties exhibited by both
7 parties with regards to efficiency in this case, the Court hereby notifies the parties of its
8 intent to impose time limits for the presentation of each side's case during trial. The specific
9 limitations imposed will be revealed on the opening day of trial. Counsel are advised to plan
10 their presentations accordingly.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 Dated: 3/15/2012



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT